

# PROFITEERS IMMUNE WHILE CHICAGO CURBS THEM

## WHO'LL LOWER FOOD PRICES? THE CONSUMER! NO ONE ELSE! PROFITEERS IGNORE OFFICIALS

### CHICAGO PITILESS PUBLICITY AND FOOD ADMINISTRATOR CHECK THE PROFITEERS

#### WHEATLESS AND MEATLESS DAYS CALLED NECESSARY

##### America Must Save Food Both for Herself and Her Allies

As Multiple Commissions "Pass the Buck" the "Consumer Pays More."

TOO MUCH MACHINERY.

### The Remedy:

Drop Every Commissioner Who Doesn't Tend to Job; Stop Playing Politics.

By Sophie Irene Loeb

WHEN the Evening World took up the consumer's fight for lower priced foodstuffs I went to Mr. Hoover and asked: "Will you reduce the food prices?" He answered: "We Federal authorities will take care of the food in bulk. We will apportion that which shall stay in this country and that which shall go abroad. We will control the prices of the principal foodstuffs at the source of production and get co-operation between them and the wholesalers."

"And then what will happen?" I asked.

"That will bring the food up to your State and city officials."

"And then what will happen?" I asked.

"It is up to them."

I then went to Albany and said to the War Food Committee, "Will you reduce the food prices?"

"We must go and consult the Federal officials first," they said.

And the consumer paid more and more.

After they have gone to Washington and consulted and co-ordinated and contemplated and conjectured and concluded, I went to the Governor.

"Will you reduce the food prices?" I asked.

The Governor said: "Let's get together on a food bill and pass it."

And when the food bill came the Legislature said: "It is too late to consider such a bill in this session. Besides, it has too many teeth in it. Let's go home and think it over."

They went home, and the consumer paid more and more.

Then the Governor said: "Come back in special session; we must have a food bill."

And they came back, and the consumer paid more and more—for the special session.

And then amid loud speeches of patriotism came a food bill with a new set of false teeth.

And a commission took charge of the food bill.

I went to John Mitchell, head of the Food Commission. "Will you reduce the prices of food?" I asked.

"I can only go as far as the bill goes, and the city will have to ask for its markets, and the City Commissioner will take care of its city problems."

And the consumer paid more and more, and he went out of his

more—solving the city problem. I then went to the City Food Committee. "Will you reduce the price of food?" I asked.

"The State won't let us; we can't control prices up-State. But we are sending a lot of pamphlets out to poor people to tell them how to save."

And the poor people couldn't save another cent to save their souls.

And then they appointed a City Food Commissioner—Mr. Moskowitz.

And then Mr. Williams tried to get them all together under one roof, so as to centralize and circularize and

"I am only the Federal Commissioner, and there is the State and City Commissioners to consider, and we must co-operate and co-ordinate."

And then Mr. Williams tried to get them all together under one roof, so as to centralize and circularize and

I went to Arthur Williams and asked: "Will you reduce the food prices?"

"I am only the Federal Commissioner, and there is the State and City Commissioners to consider, and we must co-operate and co-ordinate."

And then Mr. Williams tried to get them all together under one roof, so as to centralize and circularize and

Federal way to get the city and the State to agree.

But then he had to go about his own business, which was to Hooverize every home.

And we had meatless days and wheatless days and sweetless days and no signed pledges.

And every mother, wife and daughter of us signed pledges.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then they co-operated and co-ordinated and consulted and contrived and contradicted and corrected and conferred and complicated.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then Mr. Hoover said: "Let's have a new Milk Commission."

And some people with good names were put on the Milk Commission—good people, most of whom knew something about the milk of human kindness but nothing about the kind of milk needed for babies.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then the farmers got together and said: "We can't stand this any longer. We too must co-ordinate and co-operate."

And the farmers co-ordinated and co-operated and consulted with a new combination of Cooper Union.

And then Hoover said: "You State and city officials will have to get together. Don't be so fussy about the power you think you haven't got."

And then they co-operated and co-ordinated and we had a Federal Food Board.

I went to the Federal Food Board and said: "Will you reduce the prices of food?"

"CO-OPERATION ALL WE WANT," SAID FEDERAL BOARD.

And the Federal Food Board said: "Welcome! Lower Prices is our middle name. All we want is a little co-operation."

And we co-operated.

And we suggested that we make out a list of twenty necessities of life and get the retail dealers to join us to cut out the profiteer.

We thought that was good. And we started with meat first, because The Evening World had already shown how there was a hundred per cent. difference charged for the same meat on the same street.

And the Federal Food Board sent experts around and found it was true.

And then we went to representative butcher shops and they had low-priced and high-priced beef cut up before our very eyes; and we saw the bills that the retailer had to pay to the wholesaler, and we saw the prices that were charged for the meat.

And then we agreed that there be a committee appointed to meet three times a week or more and tell the public in plain figures what were fair prices for fair meat and put out the fellow who failed to meet the fair prices.

And there were some very good

## Inalienable Citizenship for Woman Is a Right and Nationality Should Not Follow Her Marriage Certificate



PRINCESS JULIA GRANT, daughter of the late President Grant, is shown in the photograph.

### Fair Prices for Beef in New York; What Do You Pay Your Butcher?

Wholesalers report to The Evening World that while some cuts of beef are higher than a week ago, the average price is about the same. Of the fancy grade quoted there is very little in the market. New York is eating average grade meat, and fair prices are quoted hereafter. What is your butcher charging?

	Fancy Grade.	Average Grade.	Lower Grade.
Porterhouse steak	.48	.28	.25
Delmonico steak	.45	.28	.25
Sirloin steak	.42	.28	.25
Top sirloin steak	.35	.25	.22
Top round steak	.38	.25	.22
Under round steak	.35	.22	.24
Horseshoe beef	.28	.22	.22
Suet	.15	.14	.14
Fat	.07	.07	.07
Prime rib roast	.43	.28	.22
Chuck roast	.25	.22	.18
Plate and beef	.22	.18	.16
Loose bones	.25	.18	.16

And we had meatless days and wheatless days and sweetless days and no signed pledges.

And every mother, wife and daughter of us signed pledges.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then they co-operated and co-ordinated and consulted and contrived and contradicted and corrected and conferred and complicated.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then Mr. Hoover said: "Let's have a new Milk Commission."

And some people with good names were put on the Milk Commission—good people, most of whom knew something about the milk of human kindness but nothing about the kind of milk needed for babies.

And the consumer paid more and more.

And then the farmers got together and said: "We can't stand this any longer. We too must co-ordinate and co-operate."

And the farmers co-ordinated and co-operated and consulted with a new combination of Cooper Union.

And then Hoover said: "You State and city officials will have to get together. Don't be so fussy about the power you think you haven't got."

And then they co-operated and co-ordinated and we had a Federal Food Board.

I went to the Federal Food Board and said: "Will you reduce the prices of food?"

"CO-OPERATION ALL WE WANT," SAID FEDERAL BOARD.

And the Federal Food Board said: "Welcome! Lower Prices is our middle name. All we want is a little co-operation."

And we co-operated.

And we suggested that we make out a list of twenty necessities of life and get the retail dealers to join us to cut out the profiteer.

We thought that was good. And we started with meat first, because The Evening World had already shown how there was a hundred per cent. difference charged for the same meat on the same street.

And the Federal Food Board sent experts around and found it was true.

And then we went to representative butcher shops and they had low-priced and high-priced beef cut up before our very eyes; and we saw the bills that the retailer had to pay to the wholesaler, and we saw the prices that were charged for the meat.

And then we agreed that there be a committee appointed to meet three times a week or more and tell the public in plain figures what were fair prices for fair meat and put out the fellow who failed to meet the fair prices.

And there were some very good

Women Called On to Support Jeannette Rankin's Bill to Make Permanent the Americanism of One Who Marries an Alien—Many American Women Were Compelled to Sacrifice Patriotism on the Altar of Love by Lack of a Law.

By Nicola Greeley-Smith.

HAVE women the right to a permanent patriotism? Or must the flag follow the marriage certificate?

An answer to these questions will be supplied when Congress votes on the bill introduced this week by Miss Jeannette Rankin, which grants American women who marry foreigners

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship, being a Russian to-day, a Roumanian next year, Spanish five years from now, everything depending on the number and nationality of her husbands she could get.

There is no more reason why women should be compelled to forswear their American citizenship through marriage than why men should have a similar choice of disabilities thrust upon them. Patriotism should be as permanent for women as for men.

The international chameleonism, the red, white and blue of her native land,

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship, being a Russian to-day, a Roumanian next year, Spanish five years from now, everything depending on the number and nationality of her husbands she could get.

There is no more reason why women should be compelled to forswear their American citizenship through marriage than why men should have a similar choice of disabilities thrust upon them. Patriotism should be as permanent for women as for men.

The international chameleonism, the red, white and blue of her native land,

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship, being a Russian to-day, a Roumanian next year, Spanish five years from now, everything depending on the number and nationality of her husbands she could get.

There is no more reason why women should be compelled to forswear their American citizenship through marriage than why men should have a similar choice of disabilities thrust upon them. Patriotism should be as permanent for women as for men.

The international chameleonism, the red, white and blue of her native land,

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship, being a Russian to-day, a Roumanian next year, Spanish five years from now, everything depending on the number and nationality of her husbands she could get.

There is no more reason why women should be compelled to forswear their American citizenship through marriage than why men should have a similar choice of disabilities thrust upon them. Patriotism should be as permanent for women as for men.

The international chameleonism, the red, white and blue of her native land,

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship, being a Russian to-day, a Roumanian next year, Spanish five years from now, everything depending on the number and nationality of her husbands she could get.

There is no more reason why women should be compelled to forswear their American citizenship through marriage than why men should have a similar choice of disabilities thrust upon them. Patriotism should be as permanent for women as for men.

The international chameleonism, the red, white and blue of her native land,

the right to retain their citizenship. Women voters of New York who are interested in making nationality as permanent for women as it is for men should write to their Congressmen urging favorable action on this bill.

Present conditions make a woman's Americanism dependent on the most unpardonable thing in the world, the making instant—and penalize her for letting love stray across the boundaries of nationality. A woman quite often is compelled to choose between love of country and love for man. If she chooses patriotism her heart must suffer always, and if she sacrifices her citizenship through love she must feel bitterly the injustice which compels her to forswear her flag.

UNDER the law which Representative Rankin seeks to set aside, a woman is assumed to be a sort of international chameleon; whose patriotism has no tint of its own but takes on the color of the man she marries.

Under this law the daughter and the granddaughter of Gen. Grant both forfeited their American citizenship. Mrs. Nellie Grant Sartoris became an Englishwoman and Julia Grant Cantuena a Russian. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also forfeited her American citizenship through marriage. Gladys Vanderbilt Schenck is to-day an enemy alien of the land of her birth because she married a Hungarian subject. The latest American woman to assume a foreign nationality through marriage is the former Mrs. Margaret Vivian Burton Thompson, who married a son of Count Bernstorff. As this was her second marriage to a German, her first husband having been divorced, Mrs. Thompson may have been a woman without a country at the time of her second marriage.

THE idea back of the law which deprives women of permanent citizenship is the old conception of woman as property, a chattel passed from father to husband, with no identity apart from theirs. This chattel could not possess an indestructible nationality, because that would create difficulties relating to the children she bore. These children took the father's nationality as a matter of course. A mother had no more control over them than a telegraph wire has over the message which it transmits. This was the universal view of a mother's mission until very recently. In the nineteenth century even, it was possible for men to will unborn children away from their mothers in the United States. It was natural enough to assume that under such conditions women could have no permanent nationality. Even today men who oppose the Rankin bill say: "What would the children be if the mother kept her nationality?" It seems to me the fact of residence might determine the status of children until they reached an age when they could make an intelligent choice and then they might elect to be Americans or otherwise, as they saw fit.

AS a matter of fact, nationality is indestructible. Only death can end Americanism when it is planted in a woman's heart. The law, however, forces her to subscribe to a lie, to live a lie, and deprives her of the protection to which her American birth should entitle her. The law assumes that patriotism has but shallow roots in a woman's soul and that it can be pulled up and transplanted any soil on which a husband happens to be born.

No, granted a certain longevity, an normally attractive woman might tour the world in the matter of her citizenship,